Research paper

The Place of Independent Infinitive Structures in the System of English Sentences

Zara V. Kostanian

Lomonosov Moscow State University,
9 Mokhovaya St., Moscow, 1250009, Russia

Abstract. The study presents a comprehensive analysis of independent infinitive structures with non-finite predicates, focusing on their syntactic, pragmatic, and stylistic aspects. These clauses, which exhibit interrogative and exclamatory features, are characterized by non-standard syntax, granting them a unique place within the system of English sentences. The paper categorizes these units into three groups: 1) Infinitive structures with the particle "to" at the front (To + infinitive); 2) Infinitive structures with a topical subject (S + to + infinitive); 3) Structures with "Why + (not) + infinitive?". Special attention is given to the first and second types of infinitive structures, which have not been the focus of prior research. These types are distinguished by specific language features, which necessitate a thorough investigation to determine their unique syntactic status. In contrast to the third type of infinitive units, two synonymous structures with the finite form of the predicate are examined to highlight differences in their pragmatic content and usage patterns. The study also presents a distribution scale of the five patterns according to their pragmatic meanings and frequency of occurrences. These models highlight the following pragmatic features: admiration, amazement, invitation, resentment, disappointment, satisfaction, solidarity, irritation, disbelief, and despair. The current study also provides a quantitative analysis of infinitive structure usage in British and American literature, revealing a predominance of negative illocutionary acts, with positive acts primarily observed in IIS1 structures. In addition, the paper has established a greater frequency of structures represented by finite verbs (CSS1 and CSS2) compared with those having non-finite predicates (IIS3). The contrastive analysis revealed significant syntactic, pragmatic, and stylistic differences between the third type of infinitive structures (IIS3) and their synonymous finite predicates (CSS1 and CSS2). Negative illocutive acts were predominant across all patterns, with positive acts primarily in IIS1. The highest frequency of occurrences was found in structures with finite predicates. Additionally, the study identified syntactic, pragmatic, and stylistic constraints on IIS3, noting the absence of to-infinitives, contrary to some linguistic claims.

Keywords: independent infinitive structures, complete sentence structure, finite predicate, nonfinite predicate, non-standard syntax, pragmatic function

Место независимых инфинитивных конструкций в системе английских предложений

З.В. Костанян

Московский государственный университет имени М.В. Ломоносова,
1250009, Россия, Москва, ул. Моховая, 9

———————————

Аннотация. Данное исследование представляет собой анализ независимых инфинитивных конструкций в английском языке, с акцентом на их синтаксические, прагматические и стилистические особенности. Эти конструкции выделяются нестандартной формой образования, что позволяет рассматривать их как особую синтаксическую единицу в системе английских предложений. В работе выделены три группы независимых инфинитивных конструкций: 1) инфинитивные конструкции с частицей "to" в начале предложения (To + инфинитив); 2) инфинитивные конструкции с тематическим подлежащим (S + to + инфинитив); 3) конструкции с вопросительной формой "Why + (not) + инфинитив?". Особое внимание в работе уделяется первой и второй группе инфинитивных конструкций (IIS1 и IIS2), которые до настоящего времени не были предметом всестороннего анализа. В данной статье они рассматриваются на разных уровнях, с выделением специфических языковых особенностей каждой группы, что делает их уникальными с точки зрения синтаксического строения. В работе также проводится сравнительный анализ третьей группы инфинитивных конструкций (ISS3) с синонимичными конструкциями, содержащими личные формы глагола (CSS1 и CSS2), в результате чего были выделены существенные синтаксические, прагматические и стилистические различия между ними, указывающие на очевидную самостоятельность ISS3 в системе английских предложений. Особое внимание в статье уделено изучению прагматической составляющей независимых инфинитивных конструкций, для чего была разработана шкала распределения пяти моделей употребления этих единиц в речи. В указанных моделях преобладают следующие признаки прагматического содержания: восхищение, удивление, приглашение, возмущение, отчаяние, разочарование, удовлетворение, солидарность, раздражение, недоверие. В статье также проведён количественный анализ употребления инфинитивных конструкций всех трёх типов на базе современной англоязычной художественной литературы, что позволило установить преобладание конструкций, содержащих отрицательные иллокутивные акты, а также зафиксирована наибольшая частотность в конструкциях с предикатами, представленными личными формами глагола (CSS1 и CSS2).

Ключевые слова: независимые инфинитивные конструкции, полное предложение, личные формы глагола, неличные формы глагола, нестандартный синтаксис, прагматическая функция

1.   Introduction

Infinitive structures are one-member constructions characterized by a verb in the nonfinite form as the main component. These syntactic units often pose challenges in terms of definition, composition and semantics, making it difficult to accurately position them within the system of English sentences. Many grammarians, including Quirk and Greenbaum [22], Eastwood [11], Parrot [20], Swan [26], Semerjyan [25], Wilkinson [30], provide only general definitions of these structures with minimal commentary. Quirk and Greenbaum refer to these infinitive clauses as "slightly less restricted kinds of Wh-question" [22, p. 203], while John Eastwood describes them as "a special pattern" [11, p. 26].

Linguists who focus more extensively on these structures offer various terms: *isolated infinitives* (Jespersen [13]), *infinitival clause* (Kreidler [15]), *infinitival sentence* (Duffley and Ens [10]) and Callies [4]), *infinitive clause* (Koz'acikova [14]), *sentence fragment* (Mittwoch [19]), *to-clauses* (Van linden [27]), *nonfinite clause* (Payne [21]), split infinitives (Matinian [17]). Radford [23, p. 342] suggests the term *infinitive phrase,* which he claims can be used interchangeably with a *nonfinite clause.*

Neither there exists consensus among linguists regarding a single definition for these structures. According to P. Matthews' dictionary [18], an infinitive structure is "any syntactic unit whose structure is, or is seen as reduced from that of a sentence, the one "which includes a verb and the elements that accompany it". The Cambridge Dictionary views infinitive structures exclusively as dependent units, claiming: "We usually use nonfinite verbs only in subordinate clauses" [5]. Similarly, Lan Geek [16] provides: "Nonfinite clauses do not have a finite verb and do not contain a subject. They are subordinate clauses that do not express a complete thought and cannot function as a sentence on their own." A somewhat intermediary position is held by R. Jacobs [12] who distinguishes finite and nonfinite clauses, noting the former can function independently, while the latter cannot. He asserts that "finite clauses require overt subjects, whereas nonfinite clauses do not" [ibid, pp. 84–85]. A. Radford [23, p. 342] sees no fundamental difference in using infinitive clauses in sentences like "He is trying to help her" and "Why not let him help her?". However, structurally, these present two different constructions: the former is an embedded clause within a full sentence, while the latter is an isolated clause with a nonfinite predicate and a null subject. As noted by R. Jacobs, embedded clauses function as arguments of predicates and can have overt subjects [12, p. 281].

Based on the above definitions, we can state that most researchers do not acknowledge the infinitive clause as an independent structure. Prior research has focused on infinitival complementation (Haan [8], Mittwoch [19], Jacobs [12], Radford [24], Koza'cikova [14], Callies [4], Aljovic [1], Veselovska [28]), whereby the presence of an overt subject is considered incompatible with these clauses. Some researchers admit that such sentence fragments are possible in affirmative statements, headlines, and titles (Mittwoch [19, p. 16]), while others argue that they cannot occur in interrogative sentences (Duffley and Ens [10, p. 221]).

The few researchers who have examined infinitive structures in depth include Jespersen [13], Wierzbicka [29], Dixon [7], Duffley and Ens [10], and Mittwoch [19], whose studies focus on the syntactic and semantic aspects of these units and highlight constraints on their use in English. However, certain key points, such as the independent nature of infinitive clauses and the presence of a subject in these clauses, require further analysis. Another issue concerns the use of the particle "to" before the infinitive. It is essential to distinguish between structures like "Why to give a bribe?" and "Why give a bribe?". Duffley and Ens [12, p. 221] argue that in the "to + infinitive" structure, the hearer is presumed to understand the motive and rationale for the suggested action, while in the bare infinitive structure, the speaker remains unaware of these motives or reasons. P. Duffley [9, pp. 86–89] claims that the "to + infinitive" structure indicates a straightforward perception of an event, while the bare infinitive involves observation and evaluation separated in time from the event described. This indicates that many aspects of infinitive clauses remain unexplored and require further investigation.

While linguists primarily focus on the semantic significance of the structures under investigation, we propose analyzing them through the lens of specific speech situation in which the verb is used, i.e. from a pragmatic perspective. We suggest that the use of "to" with the infinitive imparts a more immediate and concrete character to the situation, involving specific participants in the action. Conversely, the infinitive without "to" appears to lack a concrete foundation and serves a more general functional role akin to the gerund ("giving a bribe"). Therefore, the nature of these structures is rather controversial, and there is a need for comprehensive data to understand their precise character and usage, necessitating further exploration of their grammatical and pragmatic potentials.

This paper proposes to use the term "independent infinitive structure" (IIS) to distinguish them from a complete sentence structure with a finite verb form (CSS). The term "structure" is chosen instead of "clause" to emphasize its independent, isolated character, unlike the term "clause," which implies part of a complete syntactic unit. The study identifies three basic patterns of IISs based on their focus, structure, semantics, and pragmatics: 1) Infinitive with or without the particle "to" in the front position: (To) + inf. (IIS1); 2) Infinitive with the front subject: S + (to) + inf. (IIS2); 3) "Why" followed by the infinitive: Why + (not) + inf? (IIS3). Additionally, two synonymous structures with finite predicates are examined for contrastive analysis: 1) Why + should (not) + S + inf? (CSS1); 2) Why + do (not) + S + inf? (CSS2). The research aims to contribute to the understanding of these syntactic units by unveiling their various facets and drawing parallels with structures featuring predicates in finite forms.

2. Materials and Methodology

2.1 Materials

This study analyzes a diverse selection of novels by American and British writers published between 1958 and 2022. A diachronic analysis does not reveal consistent patterns in the frequency of the examined structures across these works, as the time periodization does not yield significant differences. Instead, the use of specific structures appears to be influenced more by the individual stylistic and writing preferences of the authors. The choice of fiction as the primary source material is motivated by the need for a broader contextual framework, often spanning entire books, which allows for a more profound and objective examination of these structures – a depth that corpus studies may not sufficiently provide. Additionally, the first type of independent infinitive structures (IIS1) is found exclusively in fiction, owing to its unique pragmatic function, particularly in representing inner speech.

2.2 Methodology

The examination involved a detailed analysis of the collected examples to classify the five patterns of clauses (IIS1, IIS2, IIS3, CSS1, and CSS2) according to their various pragmatic meanings. The following steps were taken:

a. Identification and Classification

Examples of each pattern were identified and classified based on their pragmatic meanings, such as suggestion, admiration, satisfaction, invitation, resentment, desperation, disappointment, disbelief, surprise, and annoyance.

b. Pragmatic Analysis

The distribution of pragmatic meanings was analyzed to understand how different patterns express various illocutionary acts. Special attention was given to the prevalence of negative and positive illocutionary acts within each pattern.

c. Quantitative Analysis

A quantitative distribution of the five types of clause occurrences was conducted based on the selected novels. The frequency of each pattern was calculated to determine their prevalence and to identify any notable trends or constraints.

d. Stylistic Analysis

The stylistic characteristics of the infinitive structures were examined, with a focus on the contexts in which they appear (e.g., conversational styles vs. fictional contexts) and their role in conveying the character's mental state, emotions, and feelings. This analysis also included an examination of the use of the particle "to" in IIS1 (To + inf) structures and its absence in IIS3 structures.

e. Contrastive Analysis

The study involved a contrastive analysis of IIS3 and its synonymous structures (CSS1 and CSS2) to highlight significant differences in syntactic, pragmatic, and stylistic features. The analysis also aimed to identify the factors influencing the selection of finite vs. nonfinite forms of the predicate.

By employing these methodologies, the study provides a comprehensive understanding of the pragmatic features of IISs and CSSs, contributing valuable insights into their usage and function within the English language.

3. A structural analysis of IISs

3.1 Independent infinitive structures vs various infinitive clauses

Independent infinitive structures in English exhibit visual similarities with other clause types, contributing to potential confusion in their identification. Furthermore, distinct types of these structures demonstrate correlations with various syntactic units, necessitating an individualized examination of each type for a comprehensive understanding.

3.1.1 IIS1

In English, certain structures may bear a resemblance to this type of units, yet they differ in functionality. Firstly, these structures manifest within a complete sentence as an integral constituent. Secondly, their typical placement is not in the initial position. Consider the following sentences for illustration.

1.   If it will please you
To show us so much gentry and good will
As **to expend** your time with us awhile (Shakespeare).

2.   It was quite obvious that Elizabeth was not rich enough **to afford the luxury of an artist husband and a family** (Aldington, p. 186).

3.   The priority was **to produce a book** that reflected her personality accurately (Morton, p. 26).

4.   That'll mean at least a nice invitation **to go to California and lecture** (Segal, p. 284).

As is seen, the above IIS1 perform different syntactic functions in the sentence: an object (1), an adverbial modifier of result (2), a predicative (3), and an attribute (4). Other infinitive clauses may occur in the front position, yet they differ from IIS due to their function in the sentence; often, they are affected by parcellation.

5.   Two days later, Nixon began a series of secret meetings with Kissinger and a few aides. **To discuss widening the war by invading neutral Cambodia, to destroy the enemy's supply depots** (Segal, p. 371).

6.   But then gradually it dawned on him that he had left the house and gone to his lonely, underheated cubicle for a definite reason. **To get away from Sara. To elude the beacon of her conscience** (Segal, p. 354).

7.   **Keep confidences, resist gossip. Read books by people whose perspective is different from yours** ... (M. Obama, p. 242).

8.   **To appoint a woman as managing director in his place** would not be exactly simple (Mackinlay, p. 121).

The infinitive clauses in the above sentences perform the functions of an adverbial modifier of purpose (5), an attribute (6), and a subject clause (8). As for (7), it is an imperative sentence, with the implied subject (you).

3.1.2 IIS2 (Infinitive with the front subject: S + (to) + inf.)

The second type of independent infinitive structures shares notable syntactic similarities with echo questions, raising questions about the extent to which they are identical. Many linguists define echo questions as structures designed to clarify or confirm a preceding statement (Matthews [18], Carter et al. [6], Swan [26], Radford [23], Payne [21]). Some scholars expand this definition by adding a secondary function. Eastwood [11, p. 40] captures this broader understanding, asserting: "Echo questions are used when we either do not understand what someone says or find it hard to believe." This additional aspect aligns echo questions more closely with infinitive clauses. Unlike a simple mechanical repetition of an utterance in interrogative form (e.g., "I am getting married." – "You are getting married?"), echo questions can transform a structure, introducing both structural and pragmatic changes. Consider the following dialogue:

9.   They came to call upon you – and at the same time to ask whether you would mind retiring." **"I? Retire in favor of your son!"** (Ibsen, p. 96).

We can observe several transformations that accompany the hearer's response to the speaker's statement:

a)   the finite form of the predicate < the nonfinite form (infinitive);
b)   the gerund < infinitive (retiring-retire);
c)   the extension of the structure by adding *in favor of your son;*
d)   the separate use of the subject (I) in the initial position as a result of parcellation;
e)   statement (reported speech) < exclamatory sentence.

All these transformational changes mentioned above make IS different from the form of the traditional echo question, which implies a mechanical repetition of the whole utterance or part of it.

3.2 Structural distinctions of IISs

3.2.1 IIS1 (Infinitive with or without the particle "to" in the front position)

IIS1 structures ((To) + inf.) exhibit distinctive characteristics that justify their unique position among sentence types in English. These structures are divided into two subgroups based on the infinitive: a) with the particle "to", and b) (rarely) without "to". A particularly interesting feature of IIS1 is the potential for the infinitive to be preceded by another element, such as an adverbial modifier of manner (example 10) or object (example 11).

10.   **Utterly, utterly** to forget, in the great forgetting of death (Lawrence, p. 142).

11.   **Of all the mean tricks**, to take my eggs (Lee, p. 54).

It is worth mentioning that this feature of infinitive structures has never been documented in previous studies. Although it is relatively infrequent in usage, it can add a novel parameter to the understanding of IIS1.

Typically, the infinitive in these constructions appears in its simple form, although other forms are possible. For instance, the infinitive can take the perfect form, as illustrated in the following example:

12. It wasn't I who killed her! I swear that! **To have chosen that night of all others.** God, it's been awful!" (Christie2, p. 150).

While IIS1 structures generally appear in the affirmative, the negative form is also possible:

13. **Not go along** in cold blood and kill her when she was asleep! (Christie2, p. 20).

These distinctive features set IIS1 apart from other infinitive structures, not only in terms of morphology and syntax, but also pragmatically, as they often convey a heightened degree of emotionality and function as expressive constructs ("expressives").

3.2.2 IIS2 (Infinitive with the front subject: S + (to) + inf.)

An IIS2 with a topical subject is of particular interest, as it represents an almost unique grammatical construction based on non-standard syntax. To date, there has been no research specifically addressing this type of infinitive clause. Therefore, our analysis provides an initial linguistic interpretation, acknowledging that alternative approaches may exist. Consider the following example:

14. It was incredible. **A man** in that condition **to arise and depart** (Fitzgerald, p. 274).

The distinctive nature of the structure *A man in that condition to arise and depart* lends itself to the interpretation within the framework of Transformational Grammar. It is essential to emphasize that this structure carries a heightened expressiveness, manifesting the speaker's emotional stance on the conveyed message. In this particular instance, the sentiment is disbelief, corroborated by the preceding context ("It was incredible") leading to the utterance in question. Thus, *A man in that position to arise and depart* encapsulates two underlying structures: 1) "I can't believe it", and 2) "A man in that position could arise and depart". Through transformation, the structure becomes "A man in that condition to arise and depart". In this transformed state, the illocutive force of the initial proposition lacks verbal realization in the surface structure, yet its reflection remains apparent, characterized by a concise, abrupt, and invalidated expression, thereby deviating from the conventional rules of English sentence structuring. Similar interpretative considerations can be extended to the ensuing sentences, which convey diverse emotions such as disappointment (15), resentment (16, 17), surprise (18), and disbelief (19).

15. "**A tailor like you**, Morry, **to make such a fuss**. You should be ashamed." (Mankowitz, p. 381)

16. "And **you to talk** of cruelty?" (Voynich, p. 298)

17. "**I tell** Dick what he should do or shouldn't do." (Fitzgerald, p. 296)

18. "**I look** like a banker?" (Mankowitz, p. 382)

19. **Me to marry** him? Never! (conversational)

As the above examples testify, the subject is expressed by a noun or a pronoun in the nominative or objective case. The infinitive, whether accompanied by "to" (15, 16, 19) or appearing bare (17, 18), introduces a notable challenge in justifying the selection between the two forms. In case of the compound nominal predicate, the link-verb may be omitted due to ellipsis, the structure preserving the most important communicative part.

20. "Mrs. de Winter afraid?" said Mrs. Danvers. "She was afraid of nothing and no one." (du Maurier, p. 359)

21. "But your daughter married to my son! Only think: it's impossible." (Shaw, p. 179)

The examination of IIS1 and IIS2 shows that both types have a non-standard syntax and can be pragmatically defined as expressives due to their high emotionality. As such, they can be assigned a special place in the English structure, functioning as pragmatically marked subgroups of interrogative and exclamatory sentences.

2.2.3 IIS₃ ("Why" followed by the infinitive: Why + (not) + inf?)

The third type of independent infinitive structures include the interrogative adverb "why" in the initial position. They have two forms: 1) "Why + inf.?" and 2) "Why + not + inf.?". Some linguists (Jespersen [13], Callies [4]) view them as a product of ellipsis. Callies [ibid.] notes that they are elliptical constructions in which the subject and the verbs "should" or "do" are dropped. On the surface, it might seem that we deal with ellipsis: "Why not invite them?" is an elliptic form of "Why don't you invite them?" or "Why shouldn't you invite them?". M. Swan claims [26, p. 629] that "Why not give her some flowers?" can be used in the same way as "Why don't you give her some flowers?". Parrot notes that some learners find it helpful to think of "Why not + inf.?" as an abbreviation of "Why don't you...?" [20, pp. 146–147]. However, while syntactically these structures may appear to involve ellipsis, they differ considerably from a pragmatic standpoint. The following comparison of sentences illustrates these distinctions:
   a.   Why not invite them?
   b.   Why don't you invite them?
   c.   Why shouldn't you invite them?
We find that in all of the sentences above, there is a pragmatic involvement. In (b) and (c) the question is directed to the interlocutor, in (a) the question does not necessarily refer to the interlocutor and can be perceived as a good idea for any person present or even absent during the communication. Dixon [7, p. 235] sees only a semantic difference between the above structures. He finds that questions (b) and (c) sound like an attempt to cause the action to happen and may require a response while (a) implies the potentiality for the action to take place. Hence, it has been confirmed that ellipsis may entail various structural, pragmatic, and semantic changes. M. Blokh [3, p. 371] gives a somewhat different interpretation of the nature of this clause. Analyzing the utterance "Why be so insistent, Jim? If he doesn't want to tell you." (J.O Hara), the linguist claims that the "Why + inf.?" clause is a parcellated construction of a larger speech fragment. This aligns with the view of those linguists who do not acknowledge the independent character of this syntactic unit.

Normally, an IIS₃ starts with "Why" followed by the bare infinitive in the affirmative or negative form, the latter being more common. Our analysis shows that "Why" may sometimes be preceded by conjunctive words such as *but, and, then, yet,* and *so,* which attach a certain contrastive shade to the utterance:
   22.   "**But** why want to marry me?" (Aldington, p. 208)
   23.   "**Then** why not sell the strip of land?" (Cook, p. 13)
   24.   "**Why** in heaven's name go with them then?" (Maurier, p. 55)
   25.   "**So** why bother to try?" (M. Obama, p. 33)
Biber et al. [2] characterize conjunctions *and* and *but* as "sentence-initial coordinators often occurring at paragraph boundaries, where they create a marked effect". We posit that a similar characterization may apply to the adverbs *then* (23) and *so* (25), which can be classified as sentence-initial coordinators performing nearly identical functions within the target structures. It is noteworthy to mention that they manifest a more flexible position in the sentence. So, it can be said that Why-structures function as independent units occurring in conversational English. The use of conjunctive words at the beginning of sentences is an inherent feature of these clauses, allowing them to be classified as functional variants.

3.2.3 IIS vs CSS₁ and CSS₂

As previously discussed, structures featuring "Why" exhibit semantic equivalence with constructions that use the finite form of the predicate. However, the differences between these structures have not been extensively explored. In general, an IIS with a nonfinite predicate implies the interlocutor as the subject of the predicate. Nevertheless, the structure can also convey a favorable suggestion or idea directed toward anyone present or even absent in the interaction. The following example illustrates this point.
   26.   "Listen, we all know that I don't need any pages turned. So why not stay here and play your heart's content?" (Segal, p. 101)

The speaker does not address anyone in particular but rather offers an idea for consideration to those present in the speech act, which makes this utterance essentially different from CSS1 (Why + should (not) + S + inf?), as well as CSS2 (Why + do (not) + S + inf?), where the subject is explicitly stated. It is noteworthy that in ISSs the inexplicit addressees can include:

1)   the interlocutor

27.   "Why don't you go with your wife?" (Hailey2, p. 260)

2)   the speaker

28.   "Why on earth should I be shocked?" (Arlington, p.191)

3)   the speaker and the addressee

29.   "Why don't we just drive to the place and have coffee there?" (Segal, p. 362)

4)   3d person (expressed by a noun or personal pronoun)

30.   "Why should she come back by boat and train instead of by air?" (Christie1, p. 146)

5)   the addressee and 3d person (probably not present during the interaction)

31.   "Why do you and Elizabeth live in this horrible district? It must be awfully unhealthy, especially for Elizabeth." (Aldington, p. 225)

32.   "Why don't you and Nikku go to the lobby? (Cook, p. 434)

(Nikki is sitting at a distance from the place where the conversation is held between her parents.)

It is worth mentioning that some constraints exist on the use of "Why + Inf. structures". These are:

1)   The complexity of the construction – composite sentences, sentences with homogeneous parts and appositive structures:

33.   Why, people rightly wonder, do we need to try to be so reasonable all the time? (M. Obama, p. 275)

34.   "Why should I want to shoot the girl I am going to marry?" (Christie2, p. 155)

35.   "Why don't you practice as a doctor, if you like to work so much?" (Fitzgerald, p. 248)

36.   "Why do you serve such fattening meals and keep cake and candy and ice cream in the house?" (Heller, p. 175)

2)   The use of exclamations and slang:

37.   "Why the hell do you think I was talking about?" (Heller, p. 140)

38.   "Why on earth should Ladislaus want to shoot Micky Gorman?" (Christie1, p. 170)

3)   The use of modal words and phrases:

39.   "Why should individual people have to try to change themselves when, really and truly, it's their workplace that needs to change?" (M. Obama, p. 255)

40.   "In fact, why don't you come up and assist at Hodges' autopsy?" he said. (Hailey2, p. 184)

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Pragmatic features of IISs and CSSs

The patterns IIS1 IIS2, IIS3 and their synonymous structures CSS1 and CSS2 display various illocutionary acts. Though similar in many cases, their pragmatic meanings may sometimes differ considerably. The material presented below shows the distribution of pragmatic meanings according to the type of target structures. The examination of the vast illustrative material allows us to present the classification of the five patterns of clauses according to their various pragmatic meanings: 1) **suggestion** (IIS3, CSS1, and CSS2), 2) **admiration** (IIS1), 3) **satisfaction** (IIS1), 4) **invitation** (IIS3;), 5) **resentment** (all patterns), 6) **desperation** (IIS1, IIS3, and CSS1), 7) **disappointment** (all patterns), 8) **disbelief, surprise** (IIS1, IIS3, CSS1 and CSS2, 9) **annoyance** (IIS3, CSS1 and CSS2). Negative structures are predominantly found in expressing suggestions, invitations, annoyance, and resentment. Below find examples of such clauses according to their pragmatic meanings:

1)   suggestion (IIS3, CSS1 and CSS2)

41.   "Why not go to North?" Burke said again. (Aldridge, p. 214)

42.   "Why shouldn't she support herself for a change?" (Fitzgerald, p. 58)

43. "Why don't you stop in?" (Lawrence, p. 166)

Interestingly, almost all the patterns are found in the negative form.

2) admiration (IIS$_1$)

44. Just to look up at the sky! To walk through the woods! ... To climb the hills…

To lie down and drink the clear, cold water! Five days in hell! And every day. An eternity." (Corrie, p. 310)

3) satisfaction (IIS$_1$)

45. To think I did all that and may I say – not in a shy way, oh, no." (Frank Sinatra, "My Way")

4) invitation (IIS$_3$)

46. "Why not come with us? It's a big Packard and there's only my wife.

myself… and the governess." (Fitzgerald, p. 225)

5) resentment (all patterns)

47. "To be born for the slaughter like a calf or a pig! To be violently cast back into nothing – for what? My God! For what?" (Aldington, p. 278)

48. "And you to talk of cruelty?" (Voynich, p. 298)

49. "Why do you give me asinine denials? You know I wasn't asking you what was wrong…?" (Heller, p. 385)

50. "Why should the Bank get it?" (Aldridge, p. 216)

51. "I removed a tumor. It turned out to be benign.

"Then why keep her here for three weeks?" (Hailey$_2$, p. 64)

6) desperation (all patterns, except IIS$_2$)

52. "To give up everything, to resist any human involvements that might detract from your work? Do you understand what it means to sacrifice your youth for nothing?" (Segal, p. 456)

53. "Yet why should we mourn, O Zeus, and why should we laugh? Why weep, why mock?" (Aldington, p. 173)

54. "What's wrong with me? Am I afraid of living? Why hesitate; why not settle now?" (Hailey$_2$, p. 289)

55. "Why don't you snow?" he cried at the sky". (Aldridge, p. 184)

7) disappointment (all patterns)

56. To die to sleep,

No more; and by a sleep to say we end

The heart-ache and the thousand natural shocks... (Shakespeare, p. 23)

57. "Why shouldn't we talk about what interests us, and what, after all, is extremely important to adult life and happiness?" (Aldridge, p. 181)

58. Why live in the past? (Christie$_2$, p. 181)

59. "Why do I let myself agonize over what even at best would have been no more than an amusing three-minute speech?" (Heller, p. 203)

8) disbelief, surprise (all the patterns, except IIS$_2$)

60. "To think that it was there, all the time, before my eyes, and I didn't see it?" (Christie$_2$. p. 84)

61. "Why cling on to things in their place?" (Christie$_2$, p. 181)

62. "Why do you have to work in a place where you don't like so many people?" (Heller, p. 253)

63. "Why on earth should Rebecca have committed suicide? The most unlikely person." (Maurier, p. 369)

9) annoyance (IIS$_3$, CSS$_1$ and CSS$_2$)

64. "Why bother with the one person in the world who still thinks you're a worm?" (Segal, p. 390)

65. Why should the Bank get it? Why do they keep buying up the Farm?" (Aldridge, p. 216)

66. "Why don't you go and tell the Warden to put your name for one of those territories?" (Aldridge, p. 215)

TABLE 1: Distribution of IISs and their synonymous structures according to their pragmatic meanings.

	IIS1	IIS2	IIS3	CSS1	CSS2
Suggestion	-	-	+	+	+
Admiration	+	-	-	-	-
Satisfaction	+	-	-	-	-
Invitation	-	-	+	+	+
Resentment	+	+	+	+	+
Desperation	+	-	+	+	+
Disbelief/ surprise	+	+	-	+	+
Disappointment	+	+	+	+	+
Annoyance	-	-	+	+	+

Based on the data presented in TABLE 1, our primary observation is that negative emotions exhibit a broader spectrum of linguistic expressions. Various negative illocutionary acts, including resentment, disappointment, desperation, disbelief and surprise, are represented across nearly all patterns. Conversely, positive illocutive acts such as admiration and satisfaction find expression basically in one pattern – IIS1. Other illocutionary acts such as suggestions, invitations, and annoyance are generally conveyed by IIS3, CSS1 and CSS2 encompass. Notably, IIS2 emerges as the least frequent pattern, followed by IIS1 and IIS3, aligning with a trend commonly highlighted by linguists in the study of infinitive constructions. The most prevalent patterns are CSS1 and CSS2, functioning as synonymous structures to IIS3, as they operate without the constraints imposed on the latter. Suggestions, invitations annoyance, and resentment are normally expressed in the negative form of the respective clauses. Regarding the degree of emotionality, structures IIS1 and IIS2 show the highest rate of vehemence and fervor.

4.2 Stylistic analysis of IC structures and their synonymous structures

The infinitive structures examined in the present paper reveal different stylistic characteristics. The patterns identified as IIS1 (To + inf.) are conspicuously absent in conversational styles and are predominantly observed in fictional contexts, where they are applied to articulate the character's mental state, emotions, and feelings. This linguistic device aligns with stylistic conventions, recognized as inner speech or interior dialogue, wherein the infinitive is conventionally collocated with the particle "to".

67. "To think that all these people lived many years ago." (Morton, p. 42)

68. "To break the clue, mingle, and commingle with one darkness, without afterwards or forwards." (Lawrence, p. 142)

69. "Just to look up at the sky! To walk through the woods! ... To climb the hills... To lie down and drink the clear, cold water! Five days in hell! And every day an eternity." (Corrie, p. 310)

IIS2 structures (S + inf.), which generally exhibit heightened emotional content, are prevalent in the conversational discourse, regardless of the participants' social status or education level. The following pair of sentences exemplify this assertion:

70. "I tell Dick what he should or shouldn't do!" (Fitzgerald, p. 296)

71. "I look like a banker?" (Mankowitz, p. 382)

The above utterances belong to Nicole (70), a woman of high society, and Fender (71), a warehouse clerk. In both cases, the expression of high emotionality sounds almost the same way. Frequently, the emotional intensity is further underscored by broader context provided by the author, which is duly highlighted in the examples below:

72. "Why not sue me, just for practice"? **Tom Lewis swung away from the typewriter**. (Hailey1, p. 155)

73. "I!" **she exclaimed in amazement**. "I tell Dick what he should do or shouldn't do!" (Fitzgerald, p. 296)

Regarding IIS3 (Why + inf.?) structures, it can be stated they tend to emerge in informal conversations among individuals with close or intimate relationships or within groups of peers, where linguistic complexity is often minimized and expressions are succinct. Furthermore, it is evident that individuals of elevated status, education, or authority tend to avoid employing the "Why + inf?" structure. Scrutinizing numerous examples investigated in this study substantiates this observation. However, assuming that formality is the primary criterion for distinguishing between IIS3 and CSS1 or CSS2 poses certain challenges. The examples extracted from E. Segal's novel "The Class" further illuminate this point.

74. "Then why not quit while you're ahead?" (Segal, p. 43)

75. Why doesn't Nixon just quit and put everybody – especially the country – out of its misery?" (Ibid.)

Both utterances featuring structures with finite and nonfinite forms of the predicate originate from the same character (Cathy, whose professional affiliations are linked to the White House) and pertain to the same subject matter. Moreover, these expressions are found on the same page of the book. The probable determinant for the selection between these structures lies in the sentence's length and the intricacy of its composition. As the examples testify, (75) contains 15 words, while (74) only 7 words.

TABLE 2 below provides an overview of the quantitative distribution of the five types of clause occurrences. This analysis is conducted based on a selection of ten novels authored by American and British writers, including "The Class" (E. Segal), "The Final Diagnosis" (A. Hailey), "Tender Is the Night" (F.S. Fitzgerald), "The Hunter" (J. Aldridge), "Something Happened" (J. Heller), "Death of a Hero" (R. Arlington), "Rebecca" (D. du Maurier), "Fatal Cure" (R. Cook), "The Moon and Sixpence" (S. Maugham), "At Bertram's Hotel" (A. Christie). While not extensively featured in this specific facet of the investigation, other sources are included for their singular instances of target structures, presenting intriguing cases of IS usage. The data presented in Table 2 reveals that IIS1 and IIS2 exhibit the lowest frequency of occurrences, aligning with the consensus among linguists highlighting the infrequent usage of these patterns. Conversely, CSS1 and CSS2 demonstrate the highest frequency across nearly all the analyzed books, contrasting with IIS3 structures. The relatively extensive prevalence of IIS3 in E. Segal's novel "The Class" may be attributed to the informal use of English by the characters, who are fellow students in most cases. Additionally, the substantial size of the book (531 pages) may contribute to this observed range. In J. Heller's novel, the least frequency of IIS3 occurrences can be explained by the specific character of the narrative. The protagonist, Bob Slocum, engages in a stream of consciousness encompassing various aspects of his life, leading to frequent self-directed *Why*–questions ("Why should/shouldn't I + inf?" and ("Why do/don't I + inf?"). Interestingly, the same observation can be made concerning Michelle Obama's biographical book "The Light We Carry", in which only a single case of *Why + inf.*? is registered. Below is Table 2 featuring the quantitative distribution of all the patterns in fiction.

TABLE 2: Quantitative distribution of the structures in fiction

	IIS1	IIS2	IIS3	CSS1	CSS2	Total occurrences
The Class	3,4%	0%	18%	3,8%	20%	68
The Final Diagnosis	7,7%	0%	15%	54%	13%	13
Tender is The Night	0	12%	12%	42%	35%	26
The Hunter	0	0	6,9%	24%	69%	29
Something Happened	0	0	1,8%	64%	34%	56
Death of a hero	19%	0	40%	23%	17%	47
Rebecca	0	5,3%	16%	53%	26%	19
Fatal Cure	0	0	40%	40%	21%	43
The Moon And Sixpence	0	0	0	64%	36%	11
At Betram's Hotel	45%	0	13%	20%	60%	15

The quantitative analysis demonstrates that CSS1 and CSS2, structures exhibit the highest frequency in most books, contrasting with IIS3 structures (the proportion being approximately 1:3/4). The least common is IIS2 followed by IIS1. The most widespread clauses are the synonymous structures "Why + do + S + Inf?" and "Why + should + S+ inf?", which lack the constraints imposed on IIS3 clauses.

5. CONCLUSION

The present multi-functional analysis of infinitive structures with nonfinite predicates has shown that they are characterized by non-standard syntax, which entitles them to occupy a special place in English Grammar. These units identified formally with interrogative and exclamatory sentences have been categorized as subgroups due to their specific structural, pragmatic, and stylistic dimensions. They present three primary types: 1) infinitive structures with the particle "to" at the front (To + inf.), 2) infinitive structures with a topical subject (S + to + inf), and 3) structures with Why + (to) + inf?. The inclusion in the study of the second type with the frontal subject (S + (to) +inf.) has served as a strong argument against those linguists who claim that infinitive clauses cannot have overt subjects. The contrastive analysis of the third type of infinitive structures and their synonymous constructions with finite predicates (CSS$_1$ and CSS$_2$) reveals significant differences in syntactic, pragmatic, and stylistic features. Notably, all three patterns (IIS$_3$, CSS$_1$, and CSS$_2$) expressing suggestion are found in the negative form. The pragmalinguistic analysis established the prevalence of negative illocutive acts across almost all patterns, with positive ones predominantly expressed in only one structure: IIS$_1$. The collected statistical data suggests that the highest frequency of occurrences belongs to structures with finite predicates. The study also pinpoints syntactic, pragmatic, and stylistic constraints on using IIS$_3$ units concerning CSS$_1$ and CSS$_2$. Another interesting finding is the absence of the to-infinitive in IIS$_3$, contrary to the claims of some linguists who acknowledge such a variant. This finding challenges the opinion of those researchers who recognize the rightful coexistence of the two variants.

Abbreviations

IC – Infinitive Clause

IIS – Independent Infinitive Structure

IIS$_1$ – To + inf.

IIS$_2$ – S + (to) + inf.

IIS$_3$ – Why + (not) + (to) + inf.?

CSS – Complete Sentence Structure

CSS$_1$ – Why + should + S + inf.?

CSS$_2$ – Why + do + S + inf.?

References

1. Aljovic, Nadira. *Non-Finite Clauses in English: Formal Properties and Function,* 2017, https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Nadira-Aljovic/publication/ 313927589 Nonfinite clauses in English/links/60c70b02a6fdcc2e61405cb2 (Accessed 28 February 2024).

2. Biber, Douglas. *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English/* Biber Douglas, Johansson Stig, Leech Geoffrey, Conrad Susan, Finegan Edward Harlow. London: Pierson Education Limited, 2000.

3. Blokh, Michael. *A Course of Theoretical English Grammar.* Moscow: Visshaia Shkola, 1983.

4. Callies, Marcus. Bare Infinitival Complements in Present-day English // *The Verb Phrase in English: Investigating Recent Language Change with Corpora/* Marcus Callies, Bas Aarts, Joanne Close, Geoffrey Leech and Sean Wallis (eds.). 2016, https://www.ucl.ac.uk/english-usage/projects/verb-phrase/book/callies.pdf (Accessed 24 January 2024).

5. Cambridge Dictionary, https://dictionary.cambridge.org/grammar/british-grammar/clauses-finite-and-nonfinite (Accessed 12 November 2024).

6. Carter, Ronald. *Cambridge Grammar of English/* Ronald Carter and Michael McCarthy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

7. Dixon, R.M. W. *A New Approach to English Grammar, on Semantic Principles.* Oxford: Oxford University, 1991.

8. De Haan, Pieter. Postmodifying Clauses in the English Noun Phrase: A Corpus-based Study. Amsterdam, 1989, https://Rodopi. books.google.am/books?id =1kWt (Accessed 3 December 2024).

9. Duffley, Patrick. A Natural-Language Semantic Approach to Infinitival and Gerund-Participial Complementation in English/ *English Linguistics.* 2016. P. 55–67.

10. Duffley, Patrick. *Wh-words and Infinitives in English* /Patrick Duffley and Peter Ens. Lingua 98, 1966. P. 221–141.
11. Eastwood, John. *Oxford Guide to English Grammar.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.
12. Jacobs, Roderick. *English Syntax: A Grammar for English Language Professionals.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995. 378 p.
13. Jespersen, Otto. *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles* // Part V: Syntax. Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1940.
14. Kozáciková, Zuzana. To- Infinitive in Academic Discourse - Native and Non-Native Writers Compared// *Discourse and Interaction,* Volume 8 (1), 2015. P. 53–64.
15. Kreidler, Charles. *Introducing English Semantics.* New York: Routledge, 2002. 352 p.
16. LanGeek. English Grammar. https:// LanGeek.co/en/grammar/course/ 704/nonfinite-clauses (Accessed 4 March 2024).
17. Matinian, Gayaneh. The Split Infinitive in Modern English Grammar, 2022, https://www.academia.edu/91599193/ The_Split_ Infinitive_in_Modern_English_Grammar?.form=MG0AV3/ (Accessed 7 December 2024).
18. Matthews, Peter H. *Oxford Concise Dictionary of Linguistics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.
19. Mittwoch, Anita. On the Distribution of Bare Infinitive Complements in English// *Journal of Linguistics.* Volume 26 (1). Pp. 103-131. https://www.seilo.ac.jp/graduate/falit-grad-school/english-literature/academic-journals/itmo4200000068jr-att/a|592462280934 pdf. (Accessed 8 December 2023).
20. Parrot, Martin. *Grammar for English Language Teachers.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000. 470 p.
21. Payne, Thomas E. *Understanding English Grammar.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011. 452 p.
22. Quirk, Randolph. *A University Grammar of English* /Randolph Quirk and Sidney Greenbaum. London: Longman, 1978.
23. Radford, Andrew. *English Syntax. An introduction.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006. 398 p.
24. Radford, Andrew. *Analysing English Sentences. A Minimalist approach.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009. 526 p.
25. Semerjyan, Maria. The Split Infinitive in Modern English. https://www.academia.edu/28206300/ The_Split_Infinitive_in_ Modern_ English (Accessed 15 January 2025).
26. Swan, Michael. *Practical English Usage.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005. 635 p.
27. Van linden, An. The rise of the to-infinitive: Evidence from adjectival Complementation// *English Language and Linguistics.* Volume 4 (1), 2022. Pp. 19–51, https://orbi.uliege.be/bitstream/2268/210999/1/ AVL_2010ELL_ Riseofto-infinitive_final.pdf?form=MG0AV3 (Accessed 15 January 2025).
28. Veselovska, Ludmila. On Bare Infinitives in English, https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Ludmila-Veselovska-2/publication/325847726_On_Bare_Infinitives_in_English/links/5b28ce5f0f7e9b1d00348796/On-Bare-Infinitives-in-English.pdf?-form=MG0AV3 (Accessed 3 October 2024).
29. Wierzbicka, Ann. The Semantics of Grammar// *Studies in Language Companion Series,* 18. i-vi. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1988.
30. Wilkinson, Daniel Wong Gonzales. Split Infinitives across World Englishes. A Corpus-based Investigation, 2024, https://www.researchgate.net/profile/ Wilkinson-Daniel-Wong-Gonzales/publication/311934084_ Split_infinitives_across_World_Englishes_A_corpus-based_investigation/links/6128e734c69a4e48795fe0b1/Split-infinitives-across-World-Englishes-A-corpus-based-investigation.pdf?origi n=publication_detail&form=MG0AV3 (Accessed November 19, 2024).

Fiction

1. Aldington, Richard. *Death of a Hero.* Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1958.
2. Aldridge, James. *The Hunter.* Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1958.
3. Christie1, Agatha. *At Bertram's Hotel.* New York: Rocket Books, 1971.
4. Christie2, Agatha. *Third Girl.* London: Collins Clear-Type Press, 1970.
5. Cook, Robin. *Fatal Cure.* New York: The Berkley Publishing Group, 1995.
6. Corrie Joe. *Hewers of Coal* // 24 One-Act Plays selected by J. Hampden/ London: M. Dent & Sons, LTD, 1964.
7. Du Maurier, Daphne. *Rebecca.* London: Hunt Barnard Printing Ltd., 1978.
8. Fitzgerald F. Scott. *Tender is the Night.* Moscow: Raduga Publishers, 1983.
9. Hailey1, Arthur. *In High Places.* New York: Dell Publishing Company, 1962.
10. Hailey2, Arthur. *The Final Diagnosis.* New York: Dell Publishing Company, 1959.
11. Heller Joseph. *Something Happened.* New York: Dell Publishing Company, 1989.
12. Ibsen Henrik. The Master Builder// *Six Great Modern Plays.* New York: Dell Publishing Group, 1967.
13. Lawrence, David Herbert. *Odour of Chrysanthemums and Other Stories.* Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1977.
14. Lee, Charles. Mr. Sampson// *24 One-Act Plays* selected by J. Hampden. London: J. M. Dent &Sons LTD, 1964. Pp. 41-58.
15. Mackinlay, Leila. *No Room for Loneliness.* Manchester: Nicholls Company, Ltd., 1975.
16. Mankowitz Wolf. The Bespoke Overcoat// *24 One-Act Plays* selected by J. Hampden/ London: J. M. Dent &Sons Ltd., 1964. Pp. 374–393.
17. Maugham, W. Somerset. *The Moon and Sixpence.* Moscow: Progress. Publishers, 1972.
18. Miller, Arthur. All My Sons// *Six Great Modern Plays.* New York: Dell Publishing Group, Inc., 1967. Pp. 355–434.
19. Morton, Andrew. Diana. Her True Story // *Her Own Words.* New York: Simon& Schuster Paperbacks, 2017.
20. Obama, Michelle. *The Light We Carry.* New York: Crown, 2022.
21. Segal, Erich. *The Class.* New York: Bantam Books, Inc., 1986.
22. Shaw, George Bernard. Mrs. Warren's Profession// *Six Great Modern Plays.* New York: Dell Publishing Group, Inc. 1967. Pp. 179–258.
23. Shakespeare. [Электронный ресурс]. – URL: // Hamlet (complete text):| Open Source Shakespeare (Accessed 5 October 2024).
24. Voynich, Ethel L. *The Gadfly.* Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1958.

Сведения об авторе:

Костанян Зара Вартановна – кандидат филологических наук, доцент кафедры медиалингвистики факультета журналистики МГУ имени М.В. Ломоносова. Сфера научных интересов: сравнительное языкознание, прагмалингвистика, медиалингвистика, теоретическая грамматика английского языка.
E-mail: zarakostanian@yahoo.com.
ORCID: 0000-0003-1780-3144.

About the author:

Zara V. Kostanian, Ph.D., is Assistant Professor at the Chair of Media Linguistics of the Faculty of Journalism, Lomonosov Moscow State University. Spheres of research and professional interest include comparative linguistics, pragmalinguistics, media linguistics, theoretical grammar of English
E-mail: zarakostanian@yahoo.com. ORCID: 0000-0003-1780-3144.

Conflict of interest statement
The author declares the absence of conflict of interest.
Автор заявляет об отсутствии конфликта интересов.

* * *